REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 5-9 are pending; and no claims are amended, newly added, or canceled herewith.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1 and 5-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Boyle et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,138,158, herein "Boyle").

Turning now to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 1 and 5-9 over <u>Boyle</u>.

Claim 1 recites, in part,

detecting means for recognizing from said provision information transmitted from said first transmitting means of said first server that said first service has been provided, and detecting said second service related to said first service; second transmitting means for transmitting recommendation information for recommending said second service detected by said detecting means to said first terminal;

Independent Claims 5, 7, 8 and 9 recite similar features.

Boyle discloses a two-way interactive communication device. Further <u>Boyle</u> discloses that a web server sends a notification to a user mobile phone by a narrow band channel when a web page is updated. Alternatively, when the user mobile phone requests the updated web page, the web server sends the updated web page to the user mobile phone by a wideband channel.

However, <u>Boyle</u> does not describe or suggest transmitting recommendation information for recommending a detected related second service. The outstanding Office Action cites Figs 1 and 2, col. 5, lines 37-58 and col. 7 lines 1-12 of <u>Boyle</u> as describing this feature. Further, the outstanding Action notes that the cited portion of <u>Boyle</u> "talks about the means of a link infrastructure used to communicate information between the two networks or

the mobile device and the second network. Also it talks about having different microprocessor used for different means of transmitting the information as depicted in the figure two the objects: 202, 104, 210, 206, and 106 as the arrows indicate flow of information traffic."

In other words, <u>Boyle</u> only generally describes that information is transmitted between objects such as between two networks or between a mobile device and a network. However, nowhere does <u>Boyle</u> describe transmitting <u>recommendation information</u> for recommending a second service detected by said detecting means.

Specifically, <u>Boyle</u> describes that a mobile user subscribes to internet content such as airline information or stock prices. When this content is updated, instead of automatically updating the information cache on the mobile device the web server 202 sends a notification to the mobile letting the mobile user know that new information is available.¹

In contrast, Claim 1 describes that a first service is transmitted to a terminal. Using this first service, a second service is detected as being related to the first service. This detected second service is then transmitted to the terminal as recommended information.

Hence, in <u>Boyle</u> the user is only receiving a notification of an update in the information that he has already subscribed to, while in Claim 1, the user is receiving a recommendation about information that he has never seen before, but is related to information that he is already using.

Thus, as <u>Boyle</u> does not describe or suggest transmitting recommendation information or describe detecting a second service related to the first service, Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over <u>Boyle</u>.

3

¹ Boyle, col. 7, line 13-16.

Application No. 10/824,479 Reply to Office Action of 5/18/2006

Consequently, in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number 22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 06/04) Bradley D. Lytle Attorney of Record Registration No. 40,073

> Scott A. McKeown Registration No. 42,866

I:\ATTY\JL\251901US\251901US_AM(5.26.06).DOC